



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/925,391 | 08/09/2001 | Ronald E. Nichols | 287122-00004-2 | 5144 |

7590

12/18/2002

Debra Z. Anderson
Eckert Seamans Cherin & Mellott, LLC
44th Floor
600 Grant Street
Pittsburgh, PA 15219

EXAMINER

DANG, THUAN D

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1764

8

DATE MAILED: 12/18/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/925,391

Applicant(s)

NICHOLS ET AL.

Examiner

Thuan D. Dang

Art Unit

1764

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 September 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-32 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 28-32 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 4 and 5.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

Art Unit: 1764

DETAILED ACTION

Oath/Declaration

The oath or declaration is defective. A new oath or declaration in compliance with 37 CFR 1.67(a) identifying this application by application number and filing date is required. See MPEP §§ 602.01 and 602.02.

The oath or declaration is defective because:

It does not identify the city and either state or foreign country of residence of each inventor. The residence information may be provided on either on an application data sheet or supplemental oath or declaration.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Regarding claim 1, "said method occurring while maintaining a vacuum" on the fourth line from the last line is indefinite since it is unclear where a vacuum is maintained.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 1764

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gi (4,463,203) in view of either Roy (4,740,270) or Solbakken et al (4,250,158) in considered with the prior art admitted by applicants.

Gi discloses a process of pyrolysis of used tire and coal to produce a product comprising solid carbon, oil and fuel gas in the presence of bentonite which also contains metals such as Mg and Al (the abstract; col. 3, lines 1-24).

Gi is totally silent as to selection a pressure for the pyrolysis (see the entire patent for details). However, either Solbakken or Roy disclose operating a similar process under low pressure (the abstract of the two patents).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the Gi process by operating the pyrolysis under low pressure since while Solbakken discloses that a low pressure pyrolysis optimizes oil yield at the expense of fuel gas generation and produces higher quality carbon black under low temperatures

Art Unit: 1764

which makes the reaction vessel cheaper to build and maintain (col. 6, line 65 thru col. 7, line 6), Roy discloses that under sub-atmospheric pressure, the yield of the highly desired liquid hydrocarbons is significantly increased while the yields of the less desired gaseous hydrocarbons and solid carbonadoes material are lowered (col. 1, line 57 thru col. 2, line 1).

Gi does not disclose that bentonite is a pillared clay or a commercial clay containing product such as cat litter and oil spill absorbent (see the entire patent for details). However, as disclosed by applicants on page 7, lines 14-25). Pillared clays, smectile ore, cat litter, and oil spill absorbent are made of or is bentonite.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the Gi process by using these materials as the bentonite in the Gi process since it is expected that using any material is or contains bentonite yields similar results.

While applicants claim an amount of the clay and metal of from 0.01 to 3.0 wt% based on the total weight of said hydrocarbon material, Gi discloses an amount of 3.1 wt% of bentonite, but does not disclose the weight ratio of the metals and clay.

However, these amounts are so close. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the Gi process by operating a process having 3 wt% of bentonite to arrive at the applicants' claimed process since it has been established by the patent law that if range of prior art and claimed range do not overlap, obviousness may still exist if the ranges are close enough that one would not expect a difference in properties. *In re Woodruff* 16 USPQ 2d 1934 (Fed. Cir. 1990); *Titanium*

Art Unit: 1764

Metals Corp. V. Banner 227 USPQ 773 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Allers*, 105 USPQ 233 (CCPA 1955).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the Gi process by using an appropriate ratio of metals and clay to optimize the Gi process since it is expected that using any ratio of these components yields similar results.

The temperature of the process can be found on column 2, lines 30-50.

On column 2, lines 30-51, Gi discloses that the process has three different phases which has different temperature, namely 100-200°C, still 500°C, and 500-600°C.

Gi does not disclose that these phases are operated in different spaces. However, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the Gi process to do that so that the Gi process can be operated continuously.

Gi does not disclose the size of the metal particles. However, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the Gi process by selecting an appropriate sizes of these metals since it has been established that change in size, shape, etc. without special functional significance are not patentable. *Research Corp. V. Nasco Industries, Inc.* 501 f2d 358; 182 USPQ 449 (CA 7), cert. Denied 184 USPQ 193; 43 USLW 3359 (1974).

The pressure of the process can be found on col. 7, lines 7-13 of Solbakken and figure 3 of Roy.

Art Unit: 1764

Claim 27 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gi (4,463,203) in view of either Roy (4,740,270) or Solbakken et al (4,250,158) in view of Cha et al (4,983,278).

Gi discloses a process as discussed above.

Gi does not disclose that tar sands is used as the feed for the pyrolysis. However, Cha discloses that tires and tar sands are equivalent raw materials of pyrolysis (the abstract).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the Gi process by using tar sand as the feed for the Gi process to arrive at the applicants' claimed process since it is expected that using equivalent feeds yields similar results.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thuan D. Dang whose telephone number is 703-305-2658. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thu.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glenn Caldarola can be reached on 703-308-6824. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-305-5408 for regular communications and 703-305-3599 for After Final communications.

Application/Control Number: 09/925,391

Page 7

Art Unit: 1764

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0661.

Thuan D. Dang
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1764

91925401.1st
December 13, 2002

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Thuan D. Dang', written in a cursive style.